

UDC 930(437.3):94(477)(092)
DOI: 10.24919/2312-2595.1/43.184268

Віталій ТЕЛЬВАК

доктор історичних наук, професор кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін, Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, 24, вул. Івана Франка, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (telvak1@yahoo.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2445-968X>

Researcher ID: <http://www.researcherid.com/rid/X-5320-2018>

Вікторія ТЕЛЬВАК

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін, Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, 24, вул. Івана Франка, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X>

Researcher ID: <https://publons.com/researcher/3026747/viktoria-telvak/>

Бібліографічний опис статті: Telvak, V., & Telvak, V. (2019). Mykhailo Hrushevsky in reflection of Czech historiography at the end of XIX – beginning of XX century. *Проблеми гуманітарних наук: збірник наукових праць Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка. Серія Історія, 1/43*, 82–106. doi: 10.24919/2312-2595.1/43.184268.

**МИХАЙЛО ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ
У ДЗЕРКАЛІ ЧЕСЬКОЇ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЇ
КІНЦЯ ХІХ – ПОЧАТКУ ХХ СТОЛІТТЯ**

Анотація. *Мета* дослідження полягає у реконструкції чеської рецепції різнопланової діяльності М. Грушевського наприкінці ХІХ – на початку ХХ ст. **Методологічне підґрунтя** роботи становить міждисциплінарний підхід. Важливу роль відіграв біографічний метод, що передбачає вивчення історичних явищ і процесів через призму життя та творчості окремих помітних представників епохи. **Наукова новизна** статті полягає у спробі комплексного аналізу чеської рецепції різнопланової діяльності

М. Грушевського наприкінці ХІХ – на початку ХХ ст. Висновки. Чеська наука в своїх оцінках творчої діяльності М. Грушевського була об'єктивною та загалом досить прихильною. Доброзичливість та об'єктивність чеських учених при зверненні до наукового доробку автора «Історії України-Руси» є особливо помітною при порівнянні з емоційними характеристиками його доробку з боку російських і польських колег. Відсутність взаємних історичних претензій, важкий досвід імперського гніту, традиційно міцні чесько-українські культурні взаємини, особисті приятні стосунки вченого з чоловіми представниками наукового світу Богемії створили сприятливу атмосферу для побудови доволі гармонійного міжнаціонального історіографічного діалогу, в якому М. Грушевський відіграв роль лідера. Попри скептичне ставлення до антинорманізму автора «Історії України-Руси» та деякі застереження щодо сміливості його історичного моделювання, чеські вчені з великим визнанням ставилися до різнобічної культурної діяльності українського колеги, уважно відстежуючи появу його наукових творів. Найбільше визнання чеських учених здобула науково-організаційна праця М. Грушевського, що, на їх переконання, легітимізувала українознавство як важливий напрям славістичних студій.

Ключові слова: М. Грушевський; «Історія України-Руси»; реценція; рецензія; чеська історіографія.

Vitalii TELVAK

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor of the Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Str., Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (telvak1@yahoo.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2445-968X>

Researcher ID: <http://www.researcherid.com/rid/X-5320-2018>

Viktoria TELVAK

Candidate of Historical Sciences, Assistant Professor of the Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Str., Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X>

Researcher ID: <https://publons.com/researcher/3026747/viktoria-telvak/>

To cite this article: Telvak, V., & Telvak, V. (2019). Mykhailo Hrushevsky in reflection of Czech historiography at the end of XIX – beginning of XX century. *Problemy humanitarnykh nauk: zbirnyk naukovykh prats Drohobyt'skoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Franka. Serii Istorii – Problems of Humanities. History Series: a collection of scientific articles of the Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 1/43, 82–106.* doi: 10.24919/2312-2595.1/43.184268.

MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY IN REFLECTION OF CZECH HISTORIOGRAPHY AT THE END OF XIX – BEGINNING OF XX CENTURY

Summary. *The purpose of the study is to reconstruct Czech reception of diversified activities of M. Hrushevsky during the late XIX – early XX centuries. The methodological basis for the work is an interdisciplinary approach. The biographical method plays an important role, which involves the study of historical phenomena and processes through the prism of life and creative heritage of certain outstanding representatives of the era. The scientific novelty of the article isto comprehensively analyse the Czech reception of diversified activities of M. Hrushevsky during the late XIX – early XX centuries. Conclusions.* *The Czech science in its evaluations of M. Hrushevsky's creative activity was objective and generally quite favourable. The benevolence and objectivity of the Czech scholars when referring to the scientific works of the author of «History of Ukraine-Rus» are particularly noticeable when compared with the emotional assessments of his work by Russian and Polish colleagues. The lack of mutual historical claims, the difficult experience of imperial oppression, the traditionally strong Czech-Ukrainian cultural relations, the personal friendly relations of the scholar with the leading representatives of the Bohemian scientific world created a favourable atmosphere for the construction of a rather harmonious inter-ethnic historiographic dialogue. Despite the sceptical attitude towards the anti-Normanism of the author of «History of Ukraine-Rus» and some reservations about his historical modelling, Czech scholars were quite appreciative of the diverse cultural activities of their Ukrainian colleague, closely monitoring the appearance of his scientific works. Czech scholars especially recognized scientific and organizational work of M. Hrushevsky, who, in their belief, legitimized Ukrainian studies as an important field of Slavic studies.*

Keywords: M. Hrushevsky; «History of Ukraine-Rus»; perception; review; Czech historiography.

The statement of the problem. Among the current trends of modern Hrushevsky studies is the importance of the perception of M. Hrushevsky's creative heritage in the historical thought of the late 19th – beginning of the 20th centuries. At the same time, only the research of the Ukrainian Hrushevsky studies has a solid and comprehensive experience of interpretation due to the prominence of the scientist, the cruciality of his contribution to the development of different aspects of Ukrainian life of that time. The problem of perception of M. Hrushevsky's creative work in other national history schools is still little-known today. We can cite only single publications that cover the peculiarities of Russian, Polish and German Hrushevsky studies. At the same time, appealing to national traditions of interpreting the works of a prominent scientist will solve, alongside with a number of specific historiographical problems, a wider range of issues: first and foremost, ones of a cultural and scientific dimensions. It is well known that M. Hrushevsky, being in the epicentre of Ukrainian national life for a long time, embodied a contemporary Ukrainian for the Western world. Therefore, the foreign assessments of his activity can be extrapolated to the entire Ukrainian movement of the late XIX – early XX centuries.

The multifarious activity of M. Hrushevsky outside the Ukrainian environment was met with the most interested reaction by the representatives of neighbouring Slavic peoples, who have been closely observing the rapid growth of Ukrainian cultural and socio-political life since the end of the 19th century. At the same time, Russian and Polish observers, in their majority, were critical towards the revitalization of the Ukrainian movement, considering it to be a danger to the traditional foundations of expansionist policy on Ukrainian lands. As Ukrainian-Polish and Ukrainian-Russian polemics aggravated at the turn of the 19th–20th centuries, the reception of the achievements of the Ukrainian movement in the Czech scientific literature and journalism seems to be rather calm and friendly, especially concerning creative achievements of one of its leaders. This was facilitated by the establishment of close Czech-Ukrainian cultural contacts during that period, as well as by the personal friendly relations of M. Hrushevsky with the leading Czech figures.

Analysis of previous research. The problem of the Czech reception of the creative heritage of M. Hrushevsky has already been raised in the researches of V. Telvak (2008) and D. Ishchenko (2001). However, the writings of the aforementioned researchers did not take into account a significant number of newly discovered review texts, which make our research relevant.

The purpose of the article is to reconstruct the Czech reception of diversified activities of M. Hrushevsky during the late XIX – early XX centuries.

The statement of the main material. M. Hrushevsky was first mentioned in the last years of the nineteenth century on the pages of the Czech scientific periodicals. At that time, diversified activities aimed at modernizing of the Ukrainian cultural and public space of Galicia gave first results. Czech scholars were approvingly commenting on the scientific level of periodicals headed by Lviv professor of SSS, in particular, the articles of «Notes of the SSS» which were reformed from the annual journal into a two-month periodical. As an example, the authoritative periodical in Slavic circles «Český Časopis Historický» described unfavorable conditions for the development of Ukrainian science in its native language within the Russian Empire and pointed out that despite all the obstacles, the task of Ukrainian culture development was greatly accomplished by Lviv scientists, united by M. Hrushevsky at the SSS. The employee of Prague journal, philologist and folklorist Jiří Polivka stated that even possessing more than modest finances, the journal thoroughly implemented its scientific program, that justly deserved to be awarded the title of the Academy of Sciences. He emphasized on the importance of scientific publications of SSS in promotion of the achievements of Ukrainian culture and science (J.P., 1905).

Following the development of «Notes of the SSS», the Czech observers of Ukrainian cultural life repeatedly noted that the periodical had exemplary bibliographical and scientific chronicle sections. Czech colleagues wrote about that in their reviews (Pasternek, 1900; J.P., 1905; Ml., 1914) as well as in letters to the chief editor. For example, after receiving the «Notes of the SSS» as a present, the director of the Czech Ethnographic Museum, Lyubor Niederle, wrote to M. Hrushevsky: «I consider it to be my duty to express my genuine admiration for the excellent and rich scientific chronicles and biblio-

graphy in the «Notes...». Nothing like this would appear in another magazine in the near future» (Naulko, 2006, p. 632).

Other periodicals and serial editions edited by M. Hrushevsky were also admired by Czech scholars. The journal «Literary and Scientific Herald» founded by M. Hrushevsky was frequently mentioned on the pages of Czech magazines. It was also noted that the magazine presented the political platform for the chief editor and his associates who were opposed to the Polish ruling circles, and those who supported them, among whom we can mention Olexander Barvinsky (Hrushevskiy, 1898).

The scientific works of M. Hrushevsky were mentioned by representatives of the Czech scientific world after the publication of the first volume of «History of Ukraine-Rus» in 1898. Despite certain problems with the perception of the Ukrainian-language work, there were several notes about it in Czech journals. Thus, in the magazine «Český Časopis Historický» it was emphasized that the Ukrainian professor's book was written on a truly professional level and that it was the first thorough study of the early period of Ukrainian people history («Zprávy», 1899). Even more exalted were the assessments of Czech humanitarians expressed in letters to the author. For example, while expressing gratitude for the gift, L. Niederle described the book as «excellent» (Naulko, 2006, p. 635).

Founded by L. Niederle, the Prague magazine «Věstník Slovanských Starožytosti», informing about the appearance of the first volume of «History» by M. Hrushevsky, promised its readers to publish a detailed review of the book. Interestingly, the editor of «Věstník» contacted the author himself with a request to choose a possible reviewer from the circle of his acquaintances (Naulko, 2006, pp. 634–635). Following the advice of M. Hrushevsky, L. Niederle turned to the young student of the Lviv professor Myron Korduba. In order to please the author, L. Niederle agreed to place a comprehensive review of M. Korduba of the pages of the magazine in Ukrainian language (Korduba, 1899). M. Hrushevsky noticed this friendly gesture of the editorial board and in his review of the Prague magazine he noted «the progress that the editorial staff made, finally placing the Ukrainian language among other Slavic languages» (M. H., 1901).

The real interest in the work of the Lviv professor in Western Europe and in the Czech scientific environment in particular was

triggered by the publication of the first German-language «History of the Ukrainian people». This work was in fact an authorized translation of the second Ukrainian edition of the first volume of «History of Ukraine-Rus». Czech historians responded to the emergence of this book with concise bibliographic notes (Čeňěk, 1906), as well as with two informative reviews.

A profound critical review of «The History of the Ukrainian People» for the Prague magazine «Sborník Věd Právnických a Státních» was written by professor of Karl University Karel Kadlec (Kadlec, 1909b). Having received a new work from the Lviv professor as a present, the scientist, in a grateful letter dated April 30, 1908, expressed his admiration for the idea of M. Hrushevsky to translate his main work into German, the language of contemporary science, thus familiarizing Western European colleagues with his original ideas.

In his review K. Kadlec conducted a thorough analysis of the content of the work demonstrating the profound knowledge of the subject. At the beginning of his review, the Czech researcher introduces the author to readers of the reviewed book. He stated that M. Hrushevsky remained an unknown scholar for the Czechs: «although he belongs to the most interesting and most distinguished Slavic authors». Describing the various talents of the Lviv professor, K. Kadlec wrote: «A 42 years old scholar already has noteworthy literary works, and at the same time he is the head of the Ukrainian movement seeking official recognition for Ukrainian (Rusyn) nationality not only in Galicia, [...] but also in Russia, which still does not recognize the Ukrainians as a separate group. 14 years ago he moved to Lviv [...], united Rusyn writers around him, reorganized the Shevchenko Scientific Society, which by importance equals to the scientific academy for the Rusyns, briefly trained a number of talented Ukrainian historians and extended his activity for Ukrainians on the territory of the Russian Empire since 1905» (Kadlec, 1909b, p. 298). Idealizing to a certain extent the personality of M. Hrushevsky, the reviewer compared his contribution to the development of the Ukrainian culture with the significance of Frantisek Palacky for the Czech culture. For K. Kadlec Hrushevsky «...woke up people by his scientific and journalistic activity, proving the fairness of the requirement that Ukrainians be recognized as independent, distinct nation from the Russian one». It should be noted that since that review

of K. Kadlec, such a comparison of F. Palacky and M. Hrushevsky's influence for their peoples gained popularity in the Czech Hrushevsky studies.

K. Kadlec notes, that «The History of the Ukrainian People» was basically the significant contribution to the national revival. The Czech researcher devoted his close attention to the introduction in the first volume, which outlines the conceptual foundations of the entire «History of Ukraine-Rus». The reviewer fully agrees with the basic theoretical postulates of the Ukrainian scientist, calling them «heretical» in relation to the generally accepted Slavic studies of that time. K. Kadlec considers the author's emphasis on the history of culture and socio-economic life to be an appropriate accent, which suggests the continuity of the historical process of the Ukrainian people, that lived an independent political life only in the oldest period of its existence. According to K. Kadlec, M. Hrushevsky's statement about the heredity and continuity of the Ukrainian state tradition from the times of Kyiv Rus and the emphasis on the importance of the Old Rus heritage in the formation of Eastern European culture was especially courageous.

Highly appreciating the scientific level of the work, the reviewer did not overlook its debatable points. For example, he observed the insufficient argumentation of the M. Hrushevsky's hypothesis about the Antes as direct ancestors of Ukrainians, as well as the excessive categoricalness in its defense, which was rather dissonant with the general poverty of the available historical sources about that issue. In conclusion, the reviewer once again mentioned the importance of the first volume of «History of the Ukrainian people» as significant historiographical phenomenon: «[...] The work of prof. M. Hrushevsky is written with such an extraordinary erudition and relied on such a rich literature and so many sources that it truly belongs to the most outstanding achievements of Slavic literature over the past decade» (Kadlec, 1909b, pp. 301–302).

Along with a purely polemical component, the review of K. Kadlec had an extensive informative part in which he briefly acquainted the Czech readers with the contents of the remaining six volumes of «The History of Ukraine-Rus» published at that time. Explaining the necessity of such a supplement, the reviewer mentions the difficulties with the dissemination of the main work of M. Hrushevsky, espe-

cially in the Russian Empire, where he was practically forbidden in terms of the Ukrainian language. Informing the Czech reader of the content from the second to sixth volume of M. Hrushevsky's work, K. Kadlec drew attention to the richness and diversity of the problems raised by the author. Particularly, the Czech scientist marked the sixth part of the work: «Like all previous volumes, the sixth volume of Hrushevsky is based on numerous sources and rich literature, and therefore provides guarantees for its great scientific value, which is further enhanced by the well-known study of the author» (Kadlec, 1909b, p. 305).

The thorough review of the historian and publicist Jan Slavik in «Český Časopis Historický» was noticeably more critical towards the «History of the Ukrainian people». At the beginning of his review, the reviewer revealed his own credo concerning the very essence of the Ukrainian – or in reviewer's terms – the «Little Russian» question. J. Slavik claims that he does not stand at the position of those scholars who, «in the Great and Little Russians discussions, occupy an extremely negative position, which in the 1860s Russian Minister Petro Valuev expressed most fully in the words: «there was no Ukrainian nation, neither it can and will be». Next, the reviewer admitted that «this part of the dispute, when the very existence of the Little Russians as a separate ethnographic unit was seriously questioned, is already left in past. The Little Russian people exists and will always exist» (Slavik, 1908, p. 214).

At the same time, the Czech scholar raised the question of whether this people existed for a long time or differentiated on the threshold of Slavic history? He questioned Mr. Hrushevsky's positive answers to these questions. The theses of the Ukrainian scientist, as he emphasized, «are significantly different from the generally accepted view». In concluding the latter, the reviewer said that «for us, Ukrainians [...] are part of the Russian (ruského) tribe, the product of a secondary, special development that Russian (ruský) people» (Slavik, 1908, p. 214). The caution of the author in this aspect was that strong that he found it necessary to «consider only with the appropriate warning [...] the southern Russian tribes to be the ancestors of modern «malorossy», although it has become «some kind of a habit to define them as such» (Slavik, 1908, p. 214).

J. Slavik also stated that Lviv professor was not satisfied with this hypothesis, and «combined or eliminated from the Byzantine sources the identity of the Antes with the «Ukrainian» tribes». The Czech scholar consistently takes in quotes the ethnonym «Ukrainians». «An entire «Antes» hypothesis of prof. Hrushevsky is doubtful. From all the evidence given by Hrushevsky, there is no one that gives grounds to consider the Ants to be ancestors of «Ukrainians» (Slavik, 1908, p. 215). The only thing that the reviewer agrees with is that «the settlement of the ants coincided, apparently, in part with the settlements of Little Russians, but it is also very difficult to confidently state that Antes settled between the Dniester and the Dnieper, as Hrushevsky does – it is necessary to move the area southwest to Carpathians» (Slavik, 1908, p. 215). The Antes hypothesis of a Ukrainian colleague was called «carmina non prius audita» in his review.

Such a skeptical attitude of J. Slavik was aroused by M. Hrushevsky's attempt to reproduce the palette of ancient tribes, using the evidence of the Nestor Chronicle, as well as Byzantine and Arab sources. Such an attempt, as the reviewer noted, is far from new; «The only thing that is new here is that the author takes as a proven fact the statement that was and, I believe, will remain only a hypothesis». In the opinion of the critic, such an ungrounded argumentation of his hypotheses concerning the Old Rus age the Ukrainian scientist also demonstrated in other parts of the peer-reviewed work.

J. Slavik's greatest criticism was targeted at the M. Hrushevsky's Anti-Normanist theory, which was substantiated in a special appendix to the first volume. The reviewer himself called this application «a good review of the history of controversy», admiring the author's exhaustive analysis of the literature. At the same time, he said: «Hrushevsky's intention to undermine the Norman theory as well as the same efforts of his predecessors failed. And the «Slavic» hypothesis about the origin of the Kyiv principality obviously lacks objectivity» (Slavik, 1908, p. 215).

Finally, J. Slavik criticized the architectonics of the book. In his opinion, the work, at least in its German edition, was too ample, because there was an overwhelming number of occasional unnecessary details. Apart from this, the reviewer states, «the boundary of the bibliographic data has been exceeded». «What value», the columnist asked rhetorically, «has the listing Little Russian and Russian litera-

ture in a book addressed primarily to those who do not know these languages?» (Slavik, 1908, p. 215).

We do not know about the direct reaction of M. Hrushevsky to the criticism of Czech historians. Although his researcher self-esteem obviously was pleased by the attention of Western colleagues to the German-language translation of the first volume of «History of Ukraine-Rus», which cost the author considerable time waste and money. His attitude to the discussions caused by the appearance of the book was reflected in a letter to the Russian colleague Alexander Lappo-Danilevsky: «Me and my «History...», released last year in German, are now experiencing a true baptism of fire. Despite the more or less harsh comments dictated by unfriendliness to my «innovations» or personal and political prejudices, I was pleased to see that even the most unfriendly critics did not point at any real flaws in my conclusions or methods; From this angle, these unfriendly reviews, perhaps, should be appreciated even higher than friendly ones, and especially – loud compliments. This urges me to make a new revision of the book».

At the same time, M. Hrushevsky could not leave unanswered some of the criticisms of his Czech colleagues, especially regarding the appropriateness of the use of ethnonyms «Ukraine» and «Ukrainians». Such an answer was given by the Lviv professor in many reviews on the novelties in Czech historiography. M. Hrushevsky was surprised by the inertia of the research thinking of his Czech colleagues who could not get rid of the Russian imperial optics of the perception of Ukrainian history as part of the «common» one. The scholar was irritated by the treatment of contemporary Ukrainian historiography as an organic part of the Russian by Czech colleagues. This irritation is especially noticeable in the review of «Věstník slovanské filologie a starožitností» by L. Niederle: «Quite surprisingly interpreted in the edition of *Ukrainica*. One might get the impression that the distinguished Czech editors tried not to contradict the Pan-Russian views. I would not like to attribute them any to political prejudices, but it looks like that» (Hrushevskiy, 1903, p. 2).

It is worth noting that the mentioned Russophilism of L. Niederle was also criticized by some of his Czech counterparts. In particular, Professor of Karl University Jaroslav Bidlo responded with a review to the publication of a new work by L. Niederle «*Slovanský Svět*» (Praha, 1910), in which he explicitly expressed his critical view of the

position of the Ukrainian people in the scientific concept of a famous historian (Bidlo, 1910). J. Bidlo's criticism obviously contradicted the editorial policy of the magazine «Český Časopis Historický», on the pages of which a review was published, since the footnote to it stated that the editors did not always agree with the author's judgments. Interestingly, in the following years, we do not come across such notes.

The debate around the German-language first volume of «History of Ukraine-Rus» and the increasingly active work of the headed by M. Hrushevsky SSS, gave him authority and popularity among the Czech colleagues. They were more and more interested in his works written in Ukrainian language. A special attention was drawn to the «History of Ukraine-Rus» on which M. Hrushevsky worked with sublime perseverance, despite the growing public-political and scientific-organizational activities on both sides of the Zbruch region of Ukraine.

Most of the Czech researches were excited by volumes of the so-called «Cossack cycle» of «History of Ukraine-Rus». A review of the seventh volume of work devoted to the study of an important issue of the genesis of the Ukrainian Cossacks was written by already mentioned J. Slavik. He considered his critical response to be a continuation of the discussion initiated by the German-language review of the first work of Ukrainian colleague. In the introduction, the Czech scientist again reminded that M. Hrushevsky traced back the origins of the Ukrainian people to the beginnings of the ancient Rus state. The ethnonym «Ukrainians», as in beforementioned reviews, was usually written in quotation marks. Observing the scope of the research, the reviewer once again pointed at the presence of digressions with numerous details and extensive quotations, which, together with the abundance in the presentation, in his opinion, led to an excessive increase in the volume of all work: «The author often repeats himself, we can come across a lot of details twice or thrice [...], the author leaves a vast space for additional information».

However, despite these flaws, which, according to the reviewer, characterize all the volumes of «History of Ukraine-Rus», J. Slavik admitted that the peer-reviewed volume is better than the previous one in a range of aspects. «The research gets rid of prejudices», the reviewer emphasized, «and it is not biased anymore. Presentations about the origin of the Cossacks are based on, I believe, convincing sources and, perhaps, I will not be mistaken if I say in advance that

here we have for the long time the product of the main ...» (Slavik, 1910, p. 335). Among the noted drawbacks, the Czech researcher sometimes pointed at a bit careless usage of available sources, the desire of his Ukrainian colleague to say more than the documents of that era can give (Slavik, 1910, p. 339). Briefly summarizing the content of the whole volume, J. Slavik wished that Lviv professor could please the reader with the continuation of his studies on the Ukrainian Cossacks as soon as possible.

More accomplished and comprehensive reviews on the Cossack volume of «History of Ukraine-Rus» were published in two parts in Russian translation under the title «The History of Ukrainian Cossacks», in the magazine «Sbornik Věd Právnických a Státních» by K. Kadlec. Having received these books as a gift from the author, the Czech scientist expressed his admiration for the scientific prolificacy of his Ukrainian counterpart: «I am your great debtor. My review of your «Kyiv Rus» has not come out yet, and I have already received work of a greater value».

In the reviews of Cossack volumes «History of Ukraine-Rus», which K. Kadlec called «the work of the whole life of prof. Hrushevsky», special attention was devoted to acquainting the Czech reader with the content richness of the research. The critic pointed at the diligence of working out sources and literature by his Ukrainian colleague, and also emphasized on his critical approach in relation to common myths and stereotypes. K. Kadlec noted the courage of the historiographical construction of the past of the Ukrainian Cossacks, the entirely original hypotheses concerning the origin and evolution of this social strata. Summarizing the review of the first part of the «History of the Ukrainian Cossacks», the reviewer noted: «Hrushevsky for the first time gives us scientific work, in which, quite objectively, based on numerous sources, the history of the Cossacks, one of the most interesting phenomena in the history of the Slavic peoples, is presented» (K. K., 1913a, p. 442).

A similar logic was marked by an overview of the second part of «The History of the Ukrainian Cossacks»: K. Kadlec dedicated the majority of his text to an overview of the work. As in the previous case, he drew the attention of the reader to the originality of the Cossack hypotheses of the Ukrainian colleague. Summarizing his impressions, the reviewer gave an assessment of the first part: «The second volu-

me of Hrushevsky's work is marked by the same diligence as the first part» (K. K., 1915, p. 60). With similar admiration, Czech researchers also noted other Cossack works of M. Hrushevsky («Zprávy», 1909).

With similar interest Czech researchers reacted to the scientific-popular works of M. Hrushevsky. When in 1905 the Russian Empire published the Russian-language «Essay on the History of the Ukrainian People», the Czech scientific journals noted its appearance by several bibliographic reports. They stressed that the work of the Lviv professor, despite its popularization character, was the first attempt to present the Ukrainian past from prehistoric times to the beginning of the twentieth century as a whole (Čeněk, 1905).

Again, with great interest the Czech scholars met the publication of the popular «Illustrated History of Ukraine». M. Hrushevsky sent this book, as well as his other works, as a present to his Czech colleagues, receiving the words of gratitude and admiration in return. For example, after receiving the book, Konstantin Jirečekin a letter of gratitude called it «a famous work». Similar recognition was expressed in letters of Kadle.

«Časopis Musea Království Českého» in Prague responded to the new work of M. Hrushevsky with a review of his long-time sympathizer – K. Kadlec. The Czech scientist said about the importance of the scientific popularization in the latest work of Lviv professor, which better informed not only Ukrainian society, but also representatives of other peoples interested in Ukrainian affairs. Briefly summarizing the contents of the whole book and highlighting the author's story, the reviewer paid special attention to the study of the Cossack community. According to K. Kadlec, these are the best parts in the work, because the author provided not only unknown facts, but also gave them a qualitatively new interpretation (Kadlec, 1912). According to the columnist, the perfection of the author's History made it appealing and understandable to the average reader. The illustrative design of «Illustrated History of Ukraine» was approved by Kadlec as well, since it made the content more interesting for the broad circle of readers. «The value of Hrushevsky's book», the critic concluded, «consists not only in the fact that it is accessibly written in a clear and comprehensible manner, but above all that it has been written by the best connoisseur of the Ukrainian past» (Kadlec, 1912, p. 178).

K. Kadlec also responded to the Russian translation of «Illustrated History of Ukraine» by a brief bibliographic review (K. K., 1913b, p. 196). He noted that the book by M. Hrushevsky had a remarkable success in the readers' circles, as evidenced by its repeated reprint and translation into Russian. Comparing the Ukrainian and Russian publications, the reviewer fully recognized the author's right to decide on the extension of the last part of the «Illustrated History of Ukraine», which dealt with the current state of development of Ukrainian life – the era of national revival. Czech observers also appreciated an essay on the Ukrainian past by M. Hrushevsky, placed in the encyclopedia collection «Ukrainian People in its Past and Present» published in St. Petersburg on the eve of the First World War (Ml., 1914).

Alongside with the scientific and popular works, Czech commentators of Ukrainian life also appreciated the journalistic activity of M. Hrushevsky. Especially they paid attention to the speeches of the Lviv professor dedicated to the analysis of the complex Ukrainian-Polish relations in Galicia. Thus, a resonant collection of articles from the Lviv professor «On the History of Polish-Ukrainian Relations in Galicia» was frequently referenced on the pages of the «Slovansky Přehled» journal. The reviewer, with a certain embarrassment, listed the highlights of M. Hrushevsky's explanations of how the Ukrainian majority was suppressed by the Polish minority in Eastern Galicia and expressed the desire that «this book would soon become more than just theoretical» and that Ukrainians were given the rights for national autonomy (Č., 1907, p. 284).

It is interesting to note that, with the approval of M. Hrushevsky's attempts to awaken the national consciousness of the Dnieper Ukrainians through the publication of numerous popular scientific works, the Czech observers at the same time critically perceived the struggle with the educational activity of the scientist from the side of Russian intellectuals, the supporters of the monarchical ideology. Thus, on the pages of the Czech scientific journals, one of the anti-Ukrainian ideologues the professor at the University of St. Volodymyr, and at the same time the Kyiv censor Timothy Florinsky, was subjected to condemnation. The observers of his anti-Ukrainian opuses were surprised at the bias in discussing Ukrainian issues, emphasizing at the political motivation of all his struggle with Ukrainianity (Polivka, 1908).

Observers also discussed a scandalous situation around Hrushevsky's attempt to take the vacant chair of Russian history at the University of Kyiv, which was free after the death of Petro Golubovsky in 1907. Kyiv chauvinists made significant efforts to devalue scientific activity of Hrushevsky, descending to outright insinuations that became the subject of lawsuits. Despite the fact that press defended the activity of Lviv professor the department did not approve his candidature. An observer of Ukrainian life in the «Slovansky Přehled» magazine expressed his real surprise that the candidature of M. Hrushevsky – «the author of great and valuable works» – was rejected by Kyiv professors (ch., 1908).

An interesting feature of the editorial policy of the «Slovansky Přehled» magazine was that Ukrainians themselves often wrote about the latest events of Ukrainian cultural and public life. The importance of such an editorial decision was that the Czech reader received first-hand information from the most engaged activists of the national revival. Obviously, the heterogeneous work of M. Hrushevsky was in the center of discussions. Among them we can enumerate numerous reviews of Ivan Franko (Franko, 1899), Volodymyr Hnatyuk (Hnatiuk, 1903) and Ipolit Bochkovsky (Boczkowski, 1910). Occasionally, Ukrainian linguists also wrote reviews on the books of Lviv professor. As an example, we can mention Bohdan Lepky's review of «The Essay on the History of the Ukrainian People» (Lepkyj, 1907).

A peculiar result of the Czech Hrushevsky studies at the beginning of the twentieth century were publications dedicated to the commemoration of the decade of Hrushevsky's migration to Galicia (1904). This event was the first commemoration on behalf of his contemporaries and became a turning point in Ukrainian journalism as well as in the life of Galician Ukrainians. In numerous publications professor was unanimously recognized the leader in scientific and public life.

Such assessments of the importance of the cultural work of M. Hrushevsky for Galician Ukrainians were also shared by the Czech observers. For example, in 1904 Rudolf Broz in the essay «The Awakening of Little Russian People» sincerely admired vitality and diversity of the national service of Lviv Professor: «Rusyn Revival in recent years was marked by the return to scientific work. The breakthrough in Rus-Ukrainian thought led to the creation of «Shevchenko

Scientific Society» in Lviv, headed by M. Hrushevsky, a professor of history at Lviv University, who is a person of great knowledge, energy and endurance. Hrushevsky united all the Rusyns who wanted to work for the revival of their people. With a pedagogical tact, he led young people to scientific work, and clearly under his leadership, this group has achieved great results» (Brož, 1904, p. 397).

Students and friends of M. Hrushevsky presented to him the magnificently published volume of scientific works, which was published with considerable delay in 1906, on this jubilee (*Naukovyi Zbirnyk*, 1906). Actually, this great gift to M. Hrushevsky once again attracted the attention of the Czech observers to the figure of leader of Ukrainian scientific life. Recognizing the emergence of the «Scientific Collection», the Czech observers noted that the output of such a magnificent book was an indication that: «Hrushevsky has a respectful academic school around him» («Na oslavu», 1906).

The aforementioned anniversary and the publication of the «Scientific Collection» again led to presentation of M. Hrushevsky to Czech audience in the Prague journal «Slovansky Přehled». K. Kadlec was the one to represent the versatile figure of M. Hrushevsky on the journal's pages (Kadlec, 1909a). Explaining to the reader the motives of his appeal to the author of «History of Ukraine-Rus», he emphasized: «Mykhailo Hrushevsky was the first to dwell upon the Ukrainian question to a great extent, he was also the first to make a scientific substantiation of the autonomy for Ukrainian people and organize the Ukrainian movement. Even one aspect of his activity would suffice to assure the immortality of his name for the Ukrainian people» (Kadlec, 1909a, p. 163). According to the Czech scholar, his Ukrainian colleague: «...belongs to the most prolific and most profound Slavic scholars».

In the following parts K. Kadlec introduced the reader to the main milestones of M. Hrushevsky's life and creative principles, being based on his autobiography, which the historian wrote on the occasion of his fortieth birthday in 1906 (Hrushevskiyi, 1992). The Czech scientist was unanimous with the high estimates of the various work of M. Hrushevsky, expressed by colleagues of the scientist in the introduction to the aforementioned «Scientific collection». Quoting them, K. Kadlec emphasized that the organizational skills of the jubilant contributed to the rapid progress of the Lviv SSS that transformed into a true Academy of Sciences, as well as the Kyiv Ukrainian Scientific

Society (hereinafter – the KUSS). In addition, the author highlighted that due to Hrushevsky the Ukrainian science reached all scientific requirements (Kadlec, 1909a, p. 163). Apart from this, K. Kadlec concentrated on the scientific-organizational work of the scientist, stressing that under his leadership the first scientific historical school in Ukrainian academic culture arose.

Alongside with such a large-scale research and scientific-organizational activities, K. Kadlec also drew attention to the public service of the Lviv professor, where he has already practically implemented his convictions regarding the right of the Ukrainian people for free cultural and social development. Fascinated by the ideas of the socio-political journalism of the author of «History of Ukraine-Rus», the Czech scientist emphasized that on its pages the scientist not only informed readers about the state of the Ukrainian question, but also offered ways to solve it. Explaining the Czech audience the credo of Hrushevsky's politics, K. Kadlec wrote with understanding that for the Lviv professor the only acceptable solution to the Ukrainian issue in Russia was a national-territorial self-government and broad decentralization. As a result, summarizing the assessments of contemporary Ukrainian journalism, K. Kadlec pointed out at the proportionality of Hrushevsky's contribution to the development of Ukrainian life along with his great predecessors, Taras Shevchenko and Mykhailo Drahomanov.

It is interesting to note that M. Hrushevsky knew that a Czech colleague was preparing a biographical note on him, because K. Kadlec asked Ukrainian scientist to send his photo. Responding to the request of K. Kadlec, M. Hrushevsky on November 29, 1908 visited a photo shop, he left a note in his diary about this event. It should also be noted that the written biography of K. Kadlec was published on the pages of Ukrainian magazines and was written with great sympathy for the Ukrainian leader. The Bukovinian newspaper «Kamenyari», having received the permission of a Czech scientist, even published his article on its pages in the translation of Zenon Kuzela – a student of M. Hrushevsky (Kadlets, 1909).

Another indication of the popularity of M. Hrushevsky in the Czech scientific environment was also the appearance of an encyclopedic article about him in the renamed Czech encyclopedia «Ottův Slovník Naučný». From the letters of K. Kadlec, we know that he

was the initiator of the publication and the author of the biographical slogan about the Lviv professor, as he asked him to send the main biographical dates of his life and a list of scientific works. Also, at the request of K. Kadlec, M. Hrushevsky was often the mediator between those Ukrainian figures whose biographies the Czech professor considered necessary to be published on pages of «Ottův Slovník Naučný».

After the first Russian revolution of 1905, M. Hrushevsky paid more and more attention to the need to develop the cultural and scientific life of the Dnieper Ukrainians. Since then, the scientist was struggling to unify the Ukrainian lands scattered by the Zbruch border, and was torn apart between the Dniester and the Dnieper, in his words: «living in two houses». The student of the Lviv historical school Ivan Krypiakevych mentioned those years of his teacher's life: «All this time he was like a flying bird, being in Galicia, then over the Dnieper. And all this time he was alone in his mind, thinking of spreading his activity in all parts of the Ukrainian lands» (Krypiakevych, 1992).

The period of 1906–1914 was marked by the active propaganda of the Ukrainian question, an attempt to unite the disparate Ukrainian movement on the platform of the territorial-national autonomy of Ukraine while maintaining the federal structure of Russia. The proclamation of political liberties in the Romanov empire gave him the hope that the situation in Ukraine could be changed in a better constitutional way. The scientist made every effort to bring Ukrainians of Galicia and Dnieper closer to each other, making Kyiv a true center of political and cultural life for compatriots. M. Hrushevsky launched an active scientific-organizational and publishing work – initiated the founding of the Ukrainian Scientific Society and its periodicals: «Notes of the SSS» and the magazine «Ukraine». This activity was quite quickly responded to in the circle of the Czech observers of Ukrainian life, who were genuinely interested the activity of the Lviv professor and noted the high level of scientific journals he founded («Začal vycházeti», 1909).

The little-known page in the biography of M. Hrushevsky is that for a long time in Kyiv, he settled contacts with representatives of the Czech community in the city. He wrote about those new acquaintances in a diary. In particular, he referred to the name of Vaclav Vondrák from Volyn, an entrepreneur, a lawyer, a member of the Czech cultural and educational societies in Kyiv (the head of the Kyiv sports

club Sokol, a member of the Janus Amos Comenius Charitable and Educational Society) V. Vondrák was the founder and editor-publisher of the magazine «Ruský čech» – the edition named after Jan Amos Komensky, dedicated to the Czech interests in Russia, which was publishing in Kyiv from October 17, 1906 to June 27, 1908, initially as a weekly edition, and then it was issued twice a week. Since the beginning of the First World War, V. Vondrák was a member of the Kyiv Victims of War Committee. The Ukrainian scientist repeatedly traveled to St. Petersburg with him, when the Duma began its meetings in the capital.

A high recognition of the achievements of M. Hrushevsky in the study of the history and culture of the Slavic peoples by the Czech academic community was the election of him as a member of the Czech Academy of Sciences in 1911. It was firstly reported by K. Kadlec. The author of «The History of Ukraine-Rus», and both his relatives and colleagues treated this news with a significant upsurge as an evidence of the recognition of many years of scientific work and considerable efforts to popularize the achievements of modern Ukrainianity. However, the joy turned out to be premature, as the political intrigues intervened: given the emperor's status of the Academy, the approval of this appointment was delayed. In the last pre-war years, the opposition to the Ukrainian movement, Polish journalism, consistently created the image of M. Hrushevsky as a separatist, which made the choice of the Czech academic community completely vetoed by. This decision was treated by M. Hrushevsky, as evidenced by his letter to Alexei Shakhmatov, as the next manifestation of the repressive policies of imperial power against Ukrainians».

As a compensation for this refusal, the Czech intellectuals chose M. Hrushevsky as a member of the oldest scientific institution – the Czech Scientific Society, which did not need any governmental approval for its choices. The initiator of this election, L. Niederle informed Ukrainian scientist in his letter of January 8, 1914: «I have the honor to inform you that the Czech Scientific Society (Česká královská společnost náuk) has elected you yesterday as a foreign member taking into account your enormous and outstanding activity in Slavonic science» (Naulko, 2006, p. 638). Later, M. Hrushevsky received an official announcement signed by Joseph Zubatý, in which he said: «The Royal

Scientific Society of the Czech Republic, recognizing your merits to science, has decided to elect you as our current member».

It should be noted that M. Hrushevsky himself repeatedly initiated the election of Czech humanitarians, whose works concerned the history and culture of the Ukrainian people, as members of scientific institutions headed by him in Lviv and Kyiv. For example, only during 1914 he attributed the SSS membership to Jiří Polivka, and K. Kadlec was elected to the SSS.

Conclusions. Summarizing the research on the Czech Hrushevsky studies at the end of the XIX – early XX centuries, we can say that the Czech science in its evaluations of M. Hrushevsky's creative activity was objective and generally quite favourable. The benevolence and objectivity of Czech scientists when referring to the scientific works of the author of «History of Ukraine-Rus» are particularly noticeable when compared with the emotional assessments of his work by Russian and Polish colleagues. The lack of mutual historical claims, the difficult experience of imperial oppression, the traditionally strong Czech-Ukrainian cultural relations, the personal friendly relations of the scientist with the leading representatives of the Bohemian scientific world created a favourable atmosphere for the construction of a rather harmonious inter-ethnic historiographic dialogue. Despite the sceptical attitude towards the anti-Normanism of the author of «History of Ukraine-Rus» and some reservations about his historical modelling, Czech scientists were quite appreciative of the diverse cultural activities of their Ukrainian colleague, closely monitoring the appearance of his scientific works. Czech scientists especially recognized scientific and organizational work of M. Hrushevsky, who, in their belief, legitimized Ukrainian studies as an important field of Slavic studies. In this context, the Czech scientists traditionally compared M. Hrushevsky with Czech historian F. Palacky as they both were prominent for the historiography of their countries. Therefore, it is no coincidence that M. Hrushevsky received his greatest academic titles – one of a foreign member of the National Academy of Sciences – in the Czech Republic. Czech historiography also has the biggest amount of Hrushevsky studies publications: special publications dedicated to M. Hrushevsky reproduced the image of a prominent Slavic scientist, a tireless worker in the field of Ukrainian culture, a fundamental defender of national interests.

References

- Bidlo, J.** (1910). Niederle L. Slovanický Svět [Niederle L. Slavonic World]. *Český Časopis Historický – Czech Historical Journal*, 16, 68–71 [in Czech].
- Boczkowski, H.** (1910). Mykh. Hrushevskiyi. Studii z polia suspilnykh nauk i statystryky. Lviv, 1909 [Mykh. Hrushevsky. Studies in the field of social sciences and statistics. Lviv, 1909]. *Slovansky Přehled – Slavic Revue*, 12, 478–479 [in Czech].
- Brož, R.** (1904). Probuzeni maloruského národa [Awakening of the Little Russian nation]. *Slovansky Přehled – Slavic Revue*, 6, 360–401 [in Czech].
- Č.** (1907). M. Hrushevskiyi: K polsko-ukrajnskym otnosheniyam Halytsiy. Kyev, 1905. Str. 112 [M. Hrushevsky: Towards Polish-Ukrainian relations in Galicia. Kiev, 1905. P. 112]. *Slovansky Přehled – Slavic Revue*, 9, 284 [in Czech].
- Čeněk, Zibrt.** (1905). M. Hrushevskii. Ocherk ystoriy ukrajnskaho naroda. S.-Peterburh. 1904 [M. Hrushevsky. Essay on the history of the Ukrainian people. St. Petersburg. 1904]. *Časopis Musea Království Českého – The Journal of the Czech Kingdom Museum*, 79, 197 [in Czech].
- Čeněk, Zibrt.** (1906). Hruševikyj Michael. Geschichte des Ukrainischen (Ruthenischen) Volkes. 1906 [Hrushevsky Michael. History of the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) People. 1906]. *Časopis Musea Království Českého – The Journal of the Czech Kingdom Museum*, 80, 483–484 [in Czech].
- ch.** (1908). Malorusové [Little Russian]. *Slovansky Přehled – Slavic Revue*, 10, 473 [in Czech].
- Franko, I.** (1899). Literatura ukrajinsko-rusinská r. 1898 [Ukrainian-Rusyn literature in 1898]. *Slovansky Přehled – Slavic Revue*, 1, 385–390 [in Czech].
- Hnatiuk, V.** (1903). Ze Lvova [From Lviv]. *Slovansky Přehled – Slavic Revue*, 5, 128, 180 [in Czech].
- Hrushevskiyi Mykh. Istoriiia Ukrainy-Rusy. T. I. U Lvovi, 1898 [Hrushevsky Mih. History of Ukraine-Rus. Vol. I. In Lviv, 1898]. (1899). *Věstník Slovanických Starožytosti – The Slavonic Antiquities Journal*, 2, 54 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiyi, M.** (1903). Věstník slovanské filologie a starožytosti, vydavají L. Niederle, F. Pastrnek, J. Polivka, J. Zubaty. P.I. Praha. 262 s. P. II. 1902 [Journal of Slavic Philology and Antiques, published by L. Niederle, F. Pastrnek, J. Polivka, J. Zubaty. P.I. Prague. 262 p. P. II. 1902]. *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka – Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society*, 53, 2 [in Ukrainian].

- Hrushevskiy, M.** (1992). Avtobiohrafia, 1906 [Autobiography, 1906]. *Ve-lykyi Ukrainets: materialy z zhyttia ta diialnosti M.S. Hrushevskoho – Great Ukrainian: Proceedings from the life and work of M.S. Hrushevsky* (pp. 197–213). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (Ed.). (1898). Literaturno-naukovyj vistnyk [Literary and scientific journal]. *Česki lid – Czech people*, 7, 235 [in Czech].
- Ishchenko, D.V.** (2001). Kontakty M.S. Hrushevskoho z cheskoiu profesuroiu u konteksti ukraïnsko-cheskykh zviazkiv [M.S. Hrushevsky's contacts with the Czech professors in the context of Ukrainian-Czech relationships]. *Mahisterium*, 7, 84–88 [in Ukrainian].
- J.P. [Polivka J.]**. (1905). Zprávy [News]. *Český Časopis Historický – Czech Historical Journal*, 11, 468–469 [in Czech].
- K. K. [Kadlec K.]**. (1913a). Grushevskii M. Istoriiia ukraïnskogo kazachestva do soedineniia s Moskovskim gosudarstvom. T. 1: Do nachala XVII veka. Kiev, 1913 [Hrushevsky M. History of the Ukrainian Cossacks before joining the Moscow State. Vol. 1: Until the beginning of the XVII century. Kiev, 1913]. *Sborník Věd Právních a Státních – The Journal of legal and public sciences*, 13, 437–442 [in Czech].
- K. K. [Kadlec K.]**. (1913b). Grushevskii Mikh. Illiustrirovannaia istoriia Ukrainy. Sankt-Peterburg, 1913 [Hrushevsky Mikh. Illustrated History of Ukraine. Saint Petersburg, 1913]. *Sborník Věd Právních a Státních – The Journal of legal and public sciences*, 13, 196 [in Czech].
- K. K. [Kadlec K.]**. (1915). Grushevskii M. Istoriiia ukraïnskogo kazachestva do soedineniia s Moskovskim gosudarstvom. T. 2: Pervye desiatiletiiia XVII veka. Kiev, 1914 [Hrushevsky M. History of the Ukrainian Cossacks before joining the Moscow State. Vol. 2: Until the beginning of the XVII century. Kiev, 1914]. *Sborník Věd Právních a Státních – The Journal of legal and public sciences*, 15, 57–60 [in Czech].
- Kadlec, K.** (1909a). Mychajlo Hruševskij [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy]. *Slovansky Přehled – Slavic Revue*, 11, 163–167 [in Czech].
- Kadlec, K.** (1909b). Hruševskij Mychajlo. Istorija Ukrainy-Rusy (6 svazek, Lvov, 1907) a Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes (I sv. Lipsko, 1906) [Mykhailo Hrushevsky. History of the Ukraine-Rus (6th volume, Lviv, 1907) and History of the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) People (I vol. Leipzig, 1906)]. *Sborník Věd Právních a Státních – The Journal of legal and public sciences*, 9, 298–305 [in Czech].
- Kadlec, K.** (1912). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy. Illiustrovana istoriia Ukrainy. Kyiv–Lviv, 1911 [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy. Illustrated History of Ukraine. Kyiv–Lviv, 1911]. *Časopis Musea Království Českého – The Journal of the Czech Kingdom Museum*, 86, 177–178 [in Czech].

- Kadlets, K.** (1909). Mykhailo Hrushevskiyi [Mykhaylo Hrushevsky]. *Kamerniari – Stonemasons*, 17, 1–3 [in Ukrainian].
- Korduba, M.** (1899). Hrushevskiyi Mykhailo. Istoriiia Ukrainy-Rusy. T. 1: Do pochatku XI vika. U Lvovi, 1898 [Hrushevsky Mykhailo. History of Ukraine-Rus. Vol. 1: By the beginning of the XI century. In Lviv, 1898]. *Věstník Slovanských Starožytosti – The Slavonic Antiquities Journal*, 2, 63–67 [in Ukrainian].
- Krypiakevych, I.** (1992). Hrushevskiyi Mykhailo. Zhyttia i diialnist [Hrushevsky Mykhailo. Life and activities]. *Velykyi Ukrainets: materialy z zhyttia ta diialnosti M.S. Hrushevskoho – Great Ukrainian: Proceedings from the life and work of M.S. Hrushevsky* (pp. 448–483). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
- Lepkyj, B.** (1907). Zukrajinské vědy [Ukrainian science]. *Slovansky Přehled – Slavic Revue*, 9, 15–16 [in Czech].
- M. H. [Hrushevsky M.]**. (1901). Věstník slovanských starožytosti, vydává Dr. Lubor Niderle, III, 1899; IV, 1900 [Journal of Slavic Antiques, published by Dr. Lubor Niderle, III, 1899; IV, 1900]. *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka – Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society*, 42, 1–2 [in Ukrainian].
- Ml. [Máchal J.]**. (1914). Ukraïnskij narod v jeho prošlom i nastojaščem [The Ukrainian people in the past and the aspirant]. *Časopis Musea Království Českého – The Journal of the Czech Kingdom Museum*, 88, 358–359 [in Czech].
- Ml. [Máchal J.]**. (1914). Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenko. Roč. XXII, 1913 [Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Yearbook 22, 1913]. *Časopis českého museum – The Journal of the Czech Museum*, 88, 358–359 [in Czech].
- Na oslavu desítiletého působení Michala Hruševského ve Lvové [To celebrate Michal Hrushevsky's ten years in Lvov]. (1906). *Český Časopis Historický – Czech Historical Journal*, 14, 503–504 [in Czech].
- Naukovyi Zbimyk prysviachenyi profesorovy Mykhailovy Hrushevskomu uchenykamy i prykhylnykamy z nahody Yoho desiatylitnoi naukovoï pratsi v Halychyni (1894–1904) [The Scientific Collection is devoted to Professor Mikhaylo Hrushevsky's students and supporters on the occasion of his ten-year scientific work in Galicia (1894–1904)].* (1906). Lviv [in Ukrainian].
- Naulko, V.** (2006). Lysty Liubora Niderle do Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [Letters from Lubor Niederle to Mikhaylo Hrushevsky]. *Ukrainskyi arheohrafichnyi shchorichnyk. Nova seriia – Ukrainian archeographic yearbook. New series*, 10/11, 620–637 [in Ukrainian].

- Pasternek, F.** (1900). Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenko [Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society]. *Listy filologické – Philological letters*, 27, 308–310 [in Czech].
- Polivka, J.** (1908). Prof. T.D. Florinskij, Slavjanskoje plemja [Prof. T.D. Florinsky. Slavic tribe]. *Český Časopis Historický – Czech Historical Journal*, 16, 85–90 [in Czech].
- Slavik, J.** (1908). Hruševskýj Michael. Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906. I Band [History of the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) People. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906. Vol. 1]. *Český Časopis Historický – Czech Historical Journal*, 2, 214–215 [in Czech].
- Slavik, J.** (1910). Hruševskýj Michajlo. Istorija ukraïnskoj Kozaččini. T. 1. Do roku 1625. Kijev–Lvov, 1909... [Mykhailo Hrushevskiyi, History of Ukrainshn Cossacks. Vol. 1. Until 1625. Kyiv–Lviv, 1909...]. *Český Časopis Historický – Czech Historical Journal*, 16, 335 [in Czech].
- Telvak, V.** (2008). Cheska hrushevskiana pershoi tretyny XX stolittia [Czech Hrushevsky Studies in the first third of the twentieth century]. *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukraini – Historiography Research in Ukraine*, 19, 240–258 [in Ukrainian].
- Začal vycházeti nový ukrajinský védecký časopis Zapysku ukrajinskoho naukovoho tovarystva v Kyjivi [New Ukrainian scientific journal Notes of the Ukrainian Scientific Society in Kyjiv started to be published]. (1909). *Český Časopis Historický – Czech Historical Journal*, 15, 269 [in Czech].
- Zpràvy [News]. (1899). *Český Časopis Historický – Czech Historical Journal*, 5, 392 [in Czech].
- Zpràvy [News]. (1909). *Český Časopis Historický – Czech Historical Journal*, 15, 498–499 [in Czech].

Стаття надійшла до редакції 31.08.2019